

Appln. No. 10/160,077

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1233

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and further examination of this application is herein respectfully requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-15 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner would allow claims 6-9 and 15 if rewritten to be in independent form. In response thereto, claim 6 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of the original base claim 1. Similarly, claim 15 has also been amended to incorporate all the limitations of the original base claims 10, 11, and 14. For these reasons, as well as all the reasons given below, Applicants respectfully request that claims 6 and 15 be passed along to issuance.

Objected to dependent claims 7-9 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from the allowable and now independent claim 6. Thus, claims 7-9 are similarly allowable for the reasons provided above.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 4 and 14 as being indefinite, applicants have amended claim 4 to depend on claim 3 and claim 14 to depend on claim 11 in order to provide proper antecedent basis.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***Riggle Patent***

Responsive to the rejections of claims 1-5 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent No. 5,623,910 by Riggle (hereinafter "*Riggle*"), it is submitted that the cited reference does not teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 3 and 12 as amended.

Specifically, both claims 3 and 12 of the present application now recite the "valve seat is frustoconical and extends at a **second angle** relative to the axis that is **distinct from the first angle**" (emphasis added). To the contrary, *Riggle* teaches that "[v]alve seat 52 is tapered to the same degree as surface 60 to provide the mating seating surface" (emphasis added; see col. 3, lines 9-11 and Figs. 5-6). Further, the present

Appln. No. 10/160,077

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1233


application distinguishes over valves taught by *Riggle* by disclosing that having the first angle being smaller than the second angle "results in near linear contact in **contrast to seals having surface-to-surface contact** over a relatively large area, [by] providing[ing] more consistent seating of the valve body and a more consistent opening pressure" (emphasis added; see paragraph [0014], lines 11-13 of the present application). Thus, *Riggle*'s valve assembly using surface-to-surface contact is distinctly different from the valve seat as recited in amended claims 3 and 13 of the present application. Additionally, there is no suggestion or motivation in *Riggle* that would lead to the elements recited in amended claims 3 and 13.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record. Thus, claims 2-4 and 11-14 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

March 28, 2005
Date


Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)